

REMARKS

This amendment responds to the final Office Action which was mailed on September 8, 2006. In the claims, Claims 43-71 have been canceled and new Claims 72-83 substituted therefor. Claims 1-42 were previously canceled. It is respectfully submitted that Claims 72-83 are in condition for allowance. Request a favorable reconsideration of this application in light of the amendment and the remarks set forth below which constitute a full and complete response to the Office Action.

In the final Office Action, Claims 51-53 were rejected as being dependent from a rejected base claim, but it was indicated they would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 51-53 were each dependent from Claim 43 and each recited specific algorithms which were used to perform an initial agent identification by comparing the observed signs and symptoms acquired from the user interface with the agent characteristics data for each record in the database. In new Claim 72, the limitations of the specific algorithm recited in Claim 51 have been included with the limitations of original Claim 43. Therefore, since Claim 72 has been drafted to include all of the limitations of claims 51 and base claim 43, Claim 72 should now be in condition for allowance. Of course, Claim 73 is dependent from Claim 72 and further limiting thereto, therefore, Claim 73 should also be in condition for allowance.

In new Claim 74, the limitations of the specific algorithm recited in Claim 52 have been included with the limitations of original Claim 43. Therefore, since Claim 74 has been drafted to include all of the limitations of claims 52 and base claim 43, Claim 74 should now be in condition for allowance. Of course, Claim 75 is dependent from Claim

74 and further limiting thereto, therefore, Claim 75 should also be in condition for allowance.

In new Claim 76, the limitations of the specific algorithm recited in Claim 53 have been included with the limitations of original Claim 43. Therefore, since Claim 76 has been drafted to include all of the limitations of claims 53 and base claim 43, Claim 76 should now be in condition for allowance. Of course, Claim 77 is dependent from Claim 76 and further limiting thereto, therefore, Claim 77 should also be in condition for allowance.

In addition, in light of the indication of allowable subject matter for Claims 51-53, new Claim 78 has been submitted which includes the limitations of the specific algorithms recited in Claims 51-53. In other words, new system Claim 78 has been drafted to include the limitations of the allowable algorithms in a Markush format, so it is respectfully submitted that Claim 78 should be in condition for allowance. Of course, Claims 79-83 are dependent from Claim 78 and are further limiting thereto, therefore, these claims should also be in condition for allowance.

In summary, by this amendment Claims 43-71 have been canceled and new Claims 72-83 substituted therefor. Claims 72-83 remain in the case and based on the foregoing should be considered in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 72-83 are patentable and in condition for allowance. Early reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections is earnestly solicited, as is allowance of the claimed subject matter.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

DEC 05 2006 respectfully submitted,

December 4, 2006
DATE



U. John Biffoni
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 39,908
Tel. No. (410) 436-1158